



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

imous biblical tradition ascribing the Decalogue to Moses." Professor Knudson, of course, means the ethical decalogue which was unknown to J, the oldest stratum of the Hebrew tradition. It should be mentioned also that to speak of the "calf-worship" of the Israelites without explaining that by golden calves were meant little bull-images used to represent the Baals as well as Jahveh, is misleading for the general reader. This indeed is one of the points at which the pre-Deuteronomic syncretism of Baal-Jahveh, which the author minimizes, comes to expression.

In the chapters that deal with the place of the individual in the religion of early Israel and with the history of the Messianic hope, Professor Knudson calls for a reconsideration and revision of views now generally held. He thinks it "a mistake to regard Jeremiah and Ezekiel as marking the beginning of individualism." He also holds that there was a more or less developed Messianic eschatology behind the preaching of the eighth-century prophets, and that the ethical idealism of the seers and singers of Israel sprang from their Messianic hope. "Their eschatology constituted the very atmosphere of their religious life." In this the reviewer cannot follow him. But to attempt a critical estimate of these and other positions taken by the author does not lie within the scope of this review. Professor Knudson has presented his evidence in carefully reasoned discussions which will interest serious-minded readers and richly deserve the attention of scholars. He is a man of learning and wide reading. He knows the literature of his subject, states the facts comprehensively, and has a keen eye for their practical bearings. His conclusions are set forth with admirable lucidity, and often with stimulating suggestiveness. In short, the book reflects honor upon the biblical scholarship of American Methodism, and we warmly commend it to the attention of all students of the Old Testament.

WILLIAM FREDERIC BADÉ.

PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION.

ISRAEL'S SETTLEMENT IN CANAAN. C. F. BURNEY, D.LITT. Published for the British Academy, London, 1918. Pp. xi, 104. \$1.60.

With the march of archæological discovery the problem of the origins of Israel becomes an increasingly complex one. Dr. Burney does well therefore to make it the subject of his Schweich Lectures. The impulse came to him through investigation of the historical content of Judges in his recently published commentary on that book. From this vantage point he has surveyed the question in its various

aspects, and presents a view of the case which, though far from revolutionary, is both candid and judicious, learned and stimulating to thought.

In the first two chapters the Biblical tradition is carefully examined. Like all modern scholars, Dr. Burney concedes the superiority of the account given of Israel's settlement in Judges 1 1-12 5. But this also calls for closer criticism. A comparison of Judges 1 16 f. with Num. 21 1-3 and Judges 1 27 with such passages as Num. 32 39-42 and Judges 5 13-15 makes it clear that the movements of Judah, Simeon, and Manasseh there related were independent of any initiative from Joshua. The same inference applies to the other tribes who are represented as long maintaining a precarious foothold against the Canaanites. The only members of the later commonwealth of Israel, in fact, to whom the narrative ascribes any real share in the conquest under Joshua, are the Joseph tribes, settled in central Palestine. And, "if tradition is correct in making Joshua the successor of Moses in the leadership of Israel," it follows in all probability that the people whom Moses led out of Egypt at the Exodus was confined to the "household of Joseph," the remaining tribes belonging to "the floating semi-nomadic population, pressing in from the barren steppes to the northeast, which has always formed an element in the settled life of Canaan" (p. 36). This is certainly the conception we gather from the patriarchal legends of Genesis, where under the guise of eponymous heroes we find unveiled to us the wanderings and distribution of Israelite clans, "at a period possibly long prior to the entry of the Joseph tribes under Joshua" (p. 52). The elucidation of ancient legend is notoriously a field where the imagination is apt to run riot; but Dr. Burney displays a sanity of judgment, combined with a keenness of suggestion, which is worthy of all praise. We may note especially his emendation of Gen. 49 5 (pp. 38 ff.), his discussion of the early history of Levi (pp. 44 ff.), and his recognition of the astral character of the names of handmaid tribes, as contrasted with the totemistic background of a number of the purely Israelite stems (pp. 55 ff.).

In a closing lecture the external evidence is canvassed and resultant conclusions are drawn. Dr. Burney accepts the prevailing identification of the Tell el-Amarna *Habiru* and SA-GAS (ideogram for *habbatum*, "robber" or "cut-throat") with Hebrews "in the widest sense of the latter term." Scheil's discovery of *Habiru* mercenaries in the employment of the Elamite king Rîm-Sin, the contemporary of Hammurabi, is no insuperable objection to this theory, the Biblical tradition itself associating Abraham "the Hebrew"

with the same general period and locality. The Habiru are clearly Aramæan nomads who press continually westward, until in the reign of Ahnaton they occupy the whole of Palestine, from the Phœnician cities in the north to the district around Jerusalem. All this is in striking harmony with the movements of Hebrew tribes as reflected in the patriarchal traditions (pp. 82 ff.). That the main body of the Israelites had no part in the migration to Egypt is borne out by the mention of 'Asaru (the district assigned to the tribe of Asher) among the conquests of Sety I (c. 1313 B.C.), and the inclusion of Israel in the list of peoples subdued by Mineptah (c. 1222 B.C.). It is possible indeed that Israelite families may have participated in the southward movement of Amurru peoples under the Hyksos domination of Egypt, but the migration proper was confined to Joseph tribes, probably during the flourishing period of the Empire (from the reign of Thutmosi III onwards). On this view there is little reason to doubt that Ra'messe II was the Pharaoh of the oppression, and his successor Mineptah the Pharaoh of the Exodus. The contrasted theory of Mr. H. R. Hall, which connects the Exodus with the expulsion of the Hyksos, and identifies the Habiru aggressions with the conquest of Palestine by Joshua, not merely wrests the witness of the monuments, but "is obliged to do great violence to the Biblical tradition," for it crowds the campaigns of Sety, Ra'messe, and Mineptah into the period of the Judges, and otherwise alters the whole perspective of events (pp. 91 ff.).

ALEX. R. GORDON.

THE PRESBYTERIAN COLLEGE, MONTREAL.

ZOROASTRIANISM AND JUDAISM. GEORGE WILLIAM CARTER, PH.D. The Gorham Press. 1918. Pp. 116. \$2.00.

Judah Ibn Tibbon, one of the most famous translators from the Arabic into Hebrew during the Middle Ages, repeatedly emphasized the fact that to be a good translator one must possess these three qualifications: the mastery of the language from which he translates, the mastery of the language into which he translates, and the mastery of the subject-matter with which his translation deals. Slightly modified, one may apply this characterization to the author on comparative religion. To write intelligently on comparative religion one must master the systems of religion compared and their mutual relation.

The many points of resemblance between Zoroastrianism and Judaism have attracted the attention of the learned world for more